Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/unitedtestimonyo0000nlri

UNITED TESTIMONY

OF

Two Hundred Pedobaptist Scholars

TO

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

BY

REV. N. L. RIGBY.

"Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost."—JESUS. JOHN VI. 12.

"Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee."—LUKE XIX. 22.

NEW YORK:
U. D. WARD, PUBLISHER, 150 NASSAU STREET.
1876.

LIBRARY
BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS
30/8

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1875, by
REV. N. L. RIGBY,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

2 65.1
R567

PREFACE.

THE following pages are to shed light on the subject of Christian Baptism—not indeed by the presentation of original thought on the part of the author, but simply by putting the thoughts of others in readable form. In other words the light is borrowed from many stars in the literary firmament. It is, however, just as real, "For whatsoever doth make manifest is light;" while the method of uniting these scattered rays may make it even more effective. For as it illumines the path of inquiry, it will dazzle and blind the eyes of criticism. Nor can it be said, the light is colored by the medium through which it passes, for the writer has *chosen* not to express any thought in his own words. He has also scrupulously avoided any selections from Baptist authors—not because Baptist scholarship carries less authority, but because the testimony of opponents rather than that of friends is less likely to be disputed. "Since all will allow that the testimony of an adversary is good against himself."* And need I say that the

* Dr. Owen's Def. of Scrip. Ords., p. 158.

1395

number of these witnesses must have weight with the unprejudiced reader? For if ten concessions add force to argument, one hundred do much the more. "As when a hundred facts exhibit one and the same phenomenon, the expression of this phenomenon, in its generality, is the expression of a principle in philosophy; or, as when a hundred verses speak one and the same truth, this truth, sustained on the basis of a multiple testimony, may by means of one brief and comprehensive affirmation become the article of a creed."* It may also give additional weight to know that the number embraced in this plan of *uniting the testimony*, without *notes or comments*, is not over *one to fifty* of the passages rejected for want of fitness.

Nor does it militate against the argument that these authors failed to practice what they taught. For if we turn to the last chapter we shall readily discover that the reasons given are unscriptural. The plea based on *ecclesiastical authority* is Roman Catholicism. That based on a theory of *liberty, latitude, expedience, &c.*, is even worse. "Since want of faithfulness to one truth, professed in theory, involves treachery to all the rest."† For if a man may renounce one truth in revelation, and yet be sinless, he may renounce two; if two, four; if four, eight; if eight, half the Bible; if half, the whole; and yet be innocent."‡ The plea based on the common truism, "Baptism non-essential to salva-

* Dr. Chalmers, Inst., Vol. i., p. 291.

† Dr. J. Waddington, Emmaus, p. 261.

‡ J. A. James, Ch. in Earn., p. 12.

tion" amounts to saying, "If it *were* essential to my salvation, I love myself well enough to take up the cross; but since it is *not* essential to salvation, I do not love the Saviour well enough to obey His command, and follow His example."

But enough—and now with the prayer that this little volume of *united testimony* may shed its light wherever it goes, and dissipate the darkness of ignorance, prejudice or doubt from many a mind, I commit it to the public.

N. L. RIGBY.

Winfield, Kansas, Aug. 1, 1875.

P. J. LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE
Christian Baptism as introduced by John,..... 9

CHAPTER II.
Christian Baptism as adopted by Jesus, ... 13

CHAPTER III.
Christian Baptism as commanded in Scripture,..... 17

CHAPTER IV.
Christian Baptism as obeyed by the Disciples,..... 23

CHAPTER V.
Christian Baptism as typified at Pentecost,..... 27

CHAPTER VI.
Christian Baptism as a figure of Christ's sufferings,..... 29

CHAPTER VII.
Christian Baptism as a figure of death and resurrection, 32

CHAPTER VIII.
Christian Baptism as a symbol of regeneration,..... 35

CHAPTER IX.
Christian Baptism as prefigured at the Red Sea,..... .. 39

CHAPTER X. PAGE

Christian Baptism as prefigured by the Ark,..... 44

CHAPTER XI.

Christian Baptism as illustrated by divers baptisms,... 46

CHAPTER XII.

Christian Baptism as the door to the local Church,..... 50

CHAPTER XIII.

Christian Baptism as related to the Lord's Supper,..... 54

CHAPTER XIV.

Christian Baptism as to its nature from *baptizo*,..... 59

CHAPTER XV.

Christian Baptism as corroborated in history,..... 65

CHAPTER XVI.

Christian Baptism as perverted into a saving ordinance,..... 72

CHAPTER XVII.

Christian Baptism as unscripturally applied to infants, 77

CHAPTER XVIII.

Christian Baptism as substituted by pouring and sprinkling,..... 88

CHAPTER XIX.

Christian Baptism as preserved by the Baptists,..... 96

CHAPTER XX.

Christian Baptism as falsely viewed—a plea for inconsistency,..... 103

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

I.

AS INTRODUCED BY JOHN.

Its beginning, Matt. iii. 1—Its condition, Matt. iii. 2, 8, 11, repentance—Its design, Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 4, 5, *unto* repentance and remission of sins, *i. e.* because of them—Its authority, Matt. i. 25—Its mode, Mark i. 10, *Baptisma*, immersion—Corroborated.

IT is an old controversy whether the Baptism of John was a new institution, or an imitation of the baptism of proselytes as practiced by the Jews. But at all events there is no record of such a rite, conducted in the name of, and with reference to a particular person before the ministry of John.* In former times proselytes coming over from heathenism to the Jewish religion, used to wash *themselves*, which is a very different thing from baptism, or persons being washed by

* Dr. Smith. Bib. Dic. Art. Jesus Christ.

one another.* Consequently it is more likely that the Jews took the hint of proselyte baptism from the Christians *after* our Saviour's time than that He borrowed His baptism from theirs.† We find no account of baptism as a distinct religious rite before the mission of John.‡ The original institution of admitting Jews to the Covenant and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than circumcision. No account of any other is found in the Old Testament, none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, of Jonathan, of Joseph the Blind, or in the works of any other Targumist, excepting Pseudo-Jonathan, whose work belongs to the seventh or eighth century. No evidence is found in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier *Christian* writers. But how could an allusion to such a rite have escaped them all if it were as common, and as much required by usage as circumcision? In fine we are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte baptism antecedently to the Christian era. And it is difficult to see how we can avoid the conclusion that such a custom was older than the third century.

* G. Benson, D.D. † Horne's Introd. Art. Proselytes.
‡ Richard Watson, Bib. Dic. Art. Bap.

The baptism of John and of Jesus, then, I must regard as being a special appointment of heaven* —as a new law of the gospel church.† The law and the prophets were *until* John: since that time the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.‡ The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? I answer, it is described equally with the baptism of Christ, as a divine institution, and as performed under divine authority.§ And it is very certain that the ministry of John was precisely the same as that which was afterwards committed to the apostles. For their baptism was not different, though it was administered by different hands; but the sameness of their doctrine shows their baptism to have been the same—both baptized unto repentance, both unto remission of sins; both baptized in the name of Christ, from whom repentance and remission of sins proceed. And if any difference be sought for in the word of God, the only difference that will be found is, that John baptized in the name of Him who was to come, the apostles in the

* Prof. Moses Stuart on Bap., p. 140, Nashville Ed.
† Poole on Matt. iii. 15.
‡ Luke xvi. 16.
§ Knapp's Theo. p. 484.

name of Him who had already manifested Himself.*

Now, that the baptism of John was by plunging the body, seems to appear from those things which are related of him; namely, that he *baptized in Jordan*, that he baptized in *Enon, because there was much water there*, and that Christ being baptized, *came up out of the water;* to which that seems to be parallel, Acts viii. 38, *Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water, &c.*† For what need would there have been either for the Baptist's resorting to great confluxes of water, or of Philip and the Eunuch's going down into this stream, were it not that the baptism both of one and the other was to be performed by an immersion, a very little water, as it doth with us, sufficing for an affusion, or sprinkling.‡

* John Calvin, Hinton's Hist., p. 68.

† Dr. Lightfoot in A. Clark's Com. on Mark.

‡ Dr. Towerson, Sac. Bap. part iii. pp. 53-60.

II.

AS ADOPTED BY JESUS.

For what purpose, Matt. iii. 15—Thus recognizing John's Baptism—Setting us a Divine pattern—Declaring the end of His mission—The Divine approval. Matt. iii. 16, 17—A lesson of loyalty.

THE Forerunner descends with his Redeemer into the rapid waters of the now sacred river*—and Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan.† The pure waters laved His sinless body, and the Saviour, straightway coming up out of the stream stands on the bank in prayer.‡ Heaven once again opened at the baptism of Jesus—primarily for Him, and, through Him, for all mankind. He was hereby brought into personal relation with that kingdom of God, the future subjects of which were to be set apart in like manner, and entered into communication with an impure world, whose sins He was to bear. Thus the baptism of John was not only

* Bishop Elliot, Hist. Lec., p. 108.

† Scripture.

‡ J. D. Burns, Fam. Treas., p. 242, for 1861.

applicable to Jesus, but attained its real meaning and object only by the baptism of Jesus. Thus it became the symbol of His consecration unto death, for the salvation of the world.

If we inquire into the Lord's *own view* of the necessity of baptism, in His own case, He calls it a fulfilling of all righteousness*—all parts of righteousness; and therefore this, also, the earnest of the other greater parts. By a narrow view of righteousness, it would seem that John should be baptized by Jesus. By a comprehensive view of *all* righteousness, the matter was inverted.† And every answer to the inquiry, why Jesus suffered Himself to be baptized, may be considered unsatisfactory, which either regards baptism as necessary for the Lord, in the *same* sense as it was for the sinful Israelites; or, on the other hand, sees in this fact only a compliance with an existing usage of no special importance to Himself.‡ Our Lord, I think, would be baptized, that He might conciliate authority to the baptism of John, that by His own *example* He might commend and sanctify our baptism, that men might not be loth to come

* Lange, Matt. iii. 13-17, and Luke iii. 1-22.

† Bengel's Gnomon, Matt. iii. 15.

‡ Lange, Luke iii. 1-22.

to the baptism of the Lord, seeing the Lord was not backward to come to the baptism of a servant, that by His baptism He might represent the future condition of both Himself and His followers: first humble, then glorious; now mean and low, then glorious and exalted; THAT represented by IMMERSION, *this* by *emersion*—and finally, to declare by His voluntary submission to baptism, that He would not delay the delivering up of Himself to be immersed in the torrents of hell, yet with a certain faith and hope of emerging.* Thus he chose to give the sanction of His example to the baptism of John, as to a divine ordinance†—permitted the continuance of John's baptism as harmonizing with His own designs. The import of the rite being the same, whether administered by John himself, or the disciples of Jesus.‡

This ceremony, then, Christ adopted—for no ceremony could be better adapted to Christ's purpose than this—and He made it absolutely binding upon all His followers to submit to it.§ While an ordinance of which the Lord Jesus

* Witsius, from Pengilly, p. 17.
† Albert Barnes, D.D., Matt. iii. 15.
‡ Coleman, Christ. Antiq.
§ Ecce Homo, p. 96.

Christ Himself partook is not to be slightly esteemed; an ordinance to which the great Head of the Church submitted ought to be ever honorable in the eyes of professing Christians.* If it became Christ, as our surety and our example, perfectly to fulfil all righteousness, it becomes us to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of God, without exception, and to attend on every divine institution, according to the meaning and intent of it, as long as it continues in force. Thus far Christ's example is obligatory.† Then let our Lord's submitting to baptism teach us a holy exactness in the observance of those institutions which owe their obligation merely to a divine command. Surely thus it becometh all His followers to fulfil all righteousness.‡ Hence the pattern of Christ and the Apostles is more to me than all the human wisdom in the world.§

* Rev. J. C. Ryle on Matt. iii. 14–17.

† Scott, Com. on Matt. iii. 15.

‡ John Wesley on Matt. iii. 16.

§ Polhill.

III.

AS COMMANDED IN SCRIPTURE.

In Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Mark xvi. 15, 16; Acts x. 48.—Commanded, of course, to be obeyed—Loyalty to King Jesus requires this—obeyed too as commanded—The Command rests on all power—Obedience alone can claim the promise: Lo, I am with you, &c.

THE command to baptize is co-extensive with the command to preach the Gospel.* And the law of Christ requires that all who believe the Gospel should be baptized.† Then whoever knowingly and wilfully rejects baptism, treats with indifference a precept of the most exalted Messenger of God, yea of the Lord Himself, and is guilty of a much greater crime than those who rejected the baptism of John.‡ For if it be once shown to possess the authority of the Supreme Lawgiver, it will not be disputed that our first and immediate duty is compliance. What He appoints it is ours to observe. Is it,

* Dr. Smith, Bib. Dic.

† Dr. Doddridge, Mis. Works, p. 490.

‡ Quoted by Wallace on Bap, p. 85.

or is it not a Divine institution? * If it be commanded, it matters nothing, whether the obligation be moral or natural, positive or instituted. He who places before him the will of God as the rule of his life, will not refine or even dwell much upon this distinction. The ordinances of Christianity, it is true, are all of them significant. Their meaning, and even their use, is not obscure. But were it otherwise—was the design of any positive institution inexplicable; did it appear to have been proposed only as an exercise of obedience,—it is not for us to hesitate in our compliance. † With the discovery of the mind of God, inquiry ends and obedience commences. I can conceive of nothing more preposterous, than for the professed servants of Christ to be squandering their powers of invention in devising and vindicating plans of their own. ‡ Let a precept be never so difficult to obey, or never so distasteful to flesh and blood, yet if I see it is God's command, my soul says, *It is good; let me obey it till I die.* §

It will be readily allowed, also, that for any

* Dr. Wardlaw, Inf. Bap. p. 131.

† Dr. Paley, Prim. Church Mag. 1854, p. 311.

‡ Dr. Wardlaw on Nat. Est. p. 56, 60.

§ Dr. Cotton Mather. Life by Dr. Jenning, p. 118.

one to abstain from baptism, when he knows it is an institution of Christ, and that it is the will of Christ that he should subject himself to it, is such an act of disobedience to His authority, as is inconsistent with true faith.* He did not say, indeed, that a man could not be saved without baptism, but He has strongly implied that where this is neglected, *knowing* it to be a *command* of the Saviour, it endangers the salvation of the soul.† At all events, if Christ Himself who giveth salvation do require baptism, it is not for us to sound and examine Him, whether unbaptized persons may be saved, but seriously to do what is required.‡

In this day, however, there are very few in the world who judge a diligent observation of Divine institutions to be a thing of any great importance. By some they are *neglected;* by some *corrupted* with additions of their own; and by some they are *exalted* above their proper place and use, and turned into an occasion of neglecting more important duties.§ But these things ought not so to be. For God had the

* Doddridge, Mis. Works, p. 490.
† Barnes, Mark xvi. 16.
‡ Hooker in Wall's His. Inf. Bap. Vol. iv. p. 251.
§ Dr. Owen on Heb. i. 6.

wisest reasons why He would have an appointment administered in this or the other manner. It is not lawful therefore, for men to alter anything, or to mutilate the appointment. Thus the sacraments are to be used, not according to our own pleasure, but in the manner appointed by God.* For nothing is a privilege in the religious sense, but what God has made such, and He has made nothing such, except in His own way and on His own terms. Baptism is a privilege when administered and received in the manner appointed by Him, *but in no other.* When this ordinance is received in any other manner, it is plainly no obedience to any command of His, and therefore has no promise—and let me add, no encouragement to hope for a blessing.† It is then most dangerous and presumptuous to add any ceremony, or to join any service, on any pretence, unto Heaven's appointment.‡ And how can the despisers of baptism expect the approbation of the Lord, when He Himself, although He did not need baptism, so highly honored the invitation of John as to be

* Buddeus, Inst. Theol. Mor. Part I. cv. § 18, Part II. cii § 50.

† Dwight's Sermons, Vol. IV. p. 343.

‡ Archibald Hall, Gosp. Worship, Vol. I. p. 326.

baptized by him, amid the most evident tokens of the Divine favor.* It is worthy of remark that Jesus has made baptism of so much importance.† And who is the daring, insolent worm that will presume to dispute the authority, or change the ordinance of Him who is given to be Head over all things to the Church? ‡

Now what the command of Christ was in this particular, cannot well be doubted of by those who shall consider the words of Christ (in the Commission) concerning it, and the practice of those times, whether in the practice of John, or of our Saviour. Now the words of Christ are, that they should baptize, or dip, those whom they made disciples to Him—for so, no doubt, the word *baptism* properly signifies,—and such as was the practice of those times in baptizing, such in reason are we to think our Saviour's command to have been concerning it.§ According then to the principle that nothing can be lawfully performed, much less required, in the affairs of religion, which is not either commanded by God in the Scripture, or at least, re-

* Quoted by Wallace, p. 85.

† Barnes, Mark xvi. 16.

‡ Archb. Hall, Gosp. Worsp. Vol. I. p. 325.

§ Dr. Towerson, Sac. Bap. Part III. pp. 53-56.

commended by a laudable example, the baptism of infants, and the sprinkling of water in baptism, must be exterminated from the Church. *

* Bishop Sanderson, De Obliga Cons. Prelec., IV. § 17, 18.

IV.

AS OBEYED BY THE DISCIPLES.

In the spirit of loyalty to Christ—According to His example and command—By multitude on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 41); by the Ethiopian Eunuch, (Acts viii. 36, 38); by Paul, (Acts ix. 18); by Cornelius and others, (Acts x. 47, 48); by Lydia and household, (Acts xvi. 14, 15); by Philippian jailor and household, (Acts vi. 33, 34); by Crispus, Gaius and household of Stephanus, (1 Cor. xiv. 14-16).

ASSUMING the truth of our conclusion in the last chapter that baptism is an ordinance of perpetual obligation in the Christian Church, it does seem extraordinary that Christians, in the honest and diligent study of the New Testament, should be unable to discover who are to be baptized, or in what manner the rite is to be performed. For upon baptism we have more full and precise information than we have upon any other ritual observance.* As administered by the Apostles, baptism had a clear and well understood significance, and their authority determined at once

* Dr. Halley, Cong. Lec., p. 92.

how and to whom it was to be administered.* Hence the Church *adhered rigidly* to the principle, as constituting the true purport of the baptism ordained by Christ—that no one can be a member of the communion of saints, but by his own solemn vow made in the presence of the Church.† And when the Lord commanded that disciples should be baptized, the Apostles, through those things which had gone before, could have understood nothing else than that men should be immersed in water; nor did they in truth, understand anything else but immersion, as is evident from the testimony of the sacred writings.‡ This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words *baptizo*, *baptismos*, *baptistes* used to designate the rite. Then again, by the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed in the Jordan. Furthermore by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea, (1 Cor. x. 2), with the flood, (1 Peter iii. 21), with a bath, (Eph. v. 26), Titus iii. 5), with a burial and resurrection, (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12). Finally, by the general usage of colosins-

* Kitto, Vol. I., p. 294.

† Dr. Bunsen on Hippolytus and his Age.

‡ Dr. Theophilus C. Storr.

tical antiquity, which was always immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental and also the Græco-Russian Churches.*

It appears not that the *three thousand* mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, who were converted at the first sermons of Peter, were baptized any other way; and the great number of those converts is no proof that they were baptized by sprinkling, as some have conjectured. For besides that nothing obliges us to say that they were all baptized on the same day.† Though, if distributed among the *twelve* Apostles and those of the *one hundred and twenty* disciples, who were competent to the work, it is not itself absolutely inconceivable.‡ As to convenience—I must candidly, as I do cheerfully acknowledge, that there must have been abundance of water in Jerusalem to have washed away the blood of 250,000 lambs slain at one Passover. And how to reconcile the sufficiency of water for such a sacrifice with the accounts of its scarcity, may not be easy; but that sufficient water must have been in Jerusalem, I am bound to acknowledge.§ And I do wonder at

* Dr. P. Schaff, Ch. Hy., p. 568.

† Bishop Bossuet, from Stennet's Ans. to Russen, p. 175.

‡ Stacey. § Dr. Halley, pp. 216, 218.

the disingenuous artifice of learned men, who, knowing well the nature of the country, have not scrupled to make the most of this worthless argument?* A land of *brooks* of *water*, of *fountains*, and *depths* that spring out of the valleys and hills. Deut. viii. 7.

* The same, p. 312, 313.

V.

AS TYPIFIED AT PENTECOST.

PROPHESIED in Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 33.—FULFILLED at Pentecost, Acts ii. 1-4. AGAIN, in Samaria, '*as at first*,' Acts x. 44-46, xi. 15-17.—"No other instances. A baptism because an overwhelming.—Filling all the house."

THE Spirit, under the Gospel, is compared to water; and that not to a little measure to sprinkle or bedew, but to baptize the faithful in.* For the Lord saith, Ye shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit not many days after this, not in part the grace, but in all-sufficing power. For as he who sinks down in the waters and is immersed, is surrounded on all sides by the waters, so also they were completely immersed in the Holy Spirit.† Baptism in the Holy Spirit, then, is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit, or a rich and abundant communication of His gifts. For he upon whom the Holy

* Bishop Reynolds' Works, p. 226.

† Cyril of Jerusalem, Ins. 8.

Spirit is poured out is, as it were, immersed into Him.*

The basis of this usage is very plainly to be found in the designation, by *baptizo*, of the idea of *overwhelming*, *i. e.* of surrounding on all sides with fluid.† Those that are baptized with the Spirit, are as it were, plunged into that heavenly flame whose searching energy devours all their dross, tin, and base alloy.‡ And in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized; for the house in which this was done, was *filled* with the Holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fish-pool.§ Thus, the words of our Saviour were made good, Ye shall be baptized (plunged or covered) with the Holy Spirit as John baptized with water.‖ John only dipped men in water, but ye shall be imbued with the grace of the Holy Spirit.¶ He will deluge you ungrudgingly, with the graces of the Spirit.**

* Gurtlerus, Inst. Theol. c. 33, § 108.
† Prof. Moses Stuart on Bap., p. 74.
‡ Bishop Hopkins' Works, p. 519.
§ Casaubon.
‖ H. Dodwell, Gen. Del. of Christians, part 2, ch. 4, § 7.
¶ Dr. Bloomfield.
** Theophylact.

VI.

AS A FIGURE OF CHRIST'S SUFFERINGS.

Recorded in Matt. xx. 22, 23, Luke xii. 50.—Paraphrased by Doddridge—More than a Sprinkling—Illustrated in Psalms xlii. 6, 7; lxxxviii. 7: 16, 17.—Also in Classical writers—Represents the Divine wrath against sin—Set forth in His own baptism.

ARE you able to drink the bitter cup of which I am about to drink so deep, and to be baptized with the baptism—plunged into that sea of sufferings—with which I am shortly to be baptized, and as it were, overwhelmed for a time? I have indeed a most dreadful baptism to be baptized with, and I know that I shall shortly be bathed, as it were, in blood, and *plunged* in the most *overwhelming* distress.*

Here, I must acknowledge, our Baptist brethren have the advantage; for our Redeemer's sufferings must not be compared to a few drops of water sprinkled on the face, for He was *plunged* into distress, and environed with

* Dr. P. Doddridge, Parap. on Luke xiii. 50.

sorrows.* Our Lord was *filled* with sufferings within, and *covered* with them without.† He was baptized with the baptism of His sufferings, *bathed* in blood, and *plunged* in death.‡ And this metaphor of immersion in water, as expressive of being overwhelmed by affliction, is frequent, both in Scriptures and in Classical writers.§ O my God, says the Psalmist, my soul is cast down within me. All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me. Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves. Thy fierce wrath goeth over me; thy terrors have cut me off. They come round about me daily like water.¶ Immersion into water then is to be considered as exhibiting the dreadful abyss of Divine justice, in which Christ for our sins was for a time, as it were, absorbed, as in David, His type, He complains, "I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me."** Our Lord might indeed by a strong figure of speech be said to have been

* Sir H. Trelawney, on Luke xii. 50.
† John Wesley.
‡ Hervey, *Theron*, Vol. II. p. 150.
§ Dr. Bloomfield, Gr. Test. Vol. I. p. 97.
Ps. xlii. v. 7.
¶ Ps. lxxxviii. 7, 16, 17.
** Witsius, from Peng., p. 23.

immerged in sufferings, when He endured the wrath of God as the propitiation for our sins.* And there is peculiar fitness in His describing His agony and death as a baptism with which He should be baptized. A change was to take place; and for the bringing about of that change, immersion in a deep ocean of trouble was actually indispensable. He must descend into darkness, that the waves and the storms might go over Him. It was needful that He should be covered by them. And the emerging and immersion followed so closely one on the other, that you cannot better describe the great work, than by saying of our Lord that He had a baptism to be baptized with. He was plunged in the raging waters, and then quickly withdrawn.† He was baptized of John, then, to signify that He was sent that He might be *baptized*, that is, immersed in death, and that He might wash away our sins with His own blood.‡ And here our Lord intimates the purpose for which He had taken upon Him our nature; and foresees the hour when the deep waters of anguish should go even over His soul.§

* Scott, Com. on Matt. xx. 20-23.

† Dr. H. Melville, on Luke xii. 50.

‡ Archb. Sumner, Expos. Lec. on Luke xii. 49, 50.

§ Hayne's Cyclopedia, Vol. I. p. 181.

VII.

AS A FIGURE OF DEATH AND RESURRECTION.

FIRST TAUGHT by Paul.—Rom. vi. 3, 4.—REITERATED, 1 Cor. xv. 29.—Fulfilled only by immersion.—This point ought to be frankly admitted, and indeed cannot be denied with any show of reason.*

IN order to understand the figurative use of baptism, we must bear in mind the *well-known fact* that the candidate in the primitive Church was immersed in water and raised out of it again.† If baptism had been then performed as it is now among us, we should never have so much as heard of this form of expression, of dying and rising again, in this rite.‡ That it has been changed is indeed a calamity, for it placed before the eyes most aptly the symbolical meaning of baptism.§ On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized should be completely immersed in the water,

* Edinburgh Reviewers.

† Tholuck on Rom. vi. 4.

‡ Bishop Hoadly, Rom. vi. 4.

§ Matthie's Bib. Exp. of Bap.

according to the meaning of the word, and according to the signification of the ordinance, not because I think it necessary (to salvation) but because it would be beautiful to have a full and perfect sign of so perfect a thing, as also, without doubt it was instituted by Christ.* The learned, also, have rightly reminded us that, on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to have been retained in the Christian Church.† A more striking symbol could not be chosen.‡ The same plunging into water exhibits to our view that dreadful abyss of Divine justice, in which Christ, on account of our sins, was for a time in a manner swallowed up. Abiding under the water, however short the time, denotes His descent to *hades*. Emersion out of the water presents us with an image of that victory which He, though dead, obtained over death, even in His own pavilion, that is, the sepulchre.§ And thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ,‖ in like manner the baptism of believers is em-

* Martin Luther's Works, Vol. II., p. 76.
† Rosenmuller, Prof. of Theol. at Leipsic.
‡ Lange on Inf. Bap. 1834.
§ Tilenus, from Booth, Vol. I., pp. 142, 148.
‖ Scripture.

blematical of their own death, burial and resurrection*—Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming.† We are therefore in baptism conformed not only to the death of Christ, but also to His burial and resurrection.‡ The fellowship so signified is not merely a fellowship of humiliation, but also of exaltation; not alone a communion of death and the grave, but a communion likewise of resurrection and ascension.§ Since therefore, we indeed in water, but He in the earth, and we in respect to sin, but He in respect to the body was buried, on this account He did not say, "planted together in death," but "in the *likeness* of death."‖ O, strange and wonderful transaction! Not truly did we die, nor were we truly buried, nor truly crucified did we rise again; but the imitation was in a similitude, while the salvation was in truth.¶

* MacKnight on Rom. vi. 4.
† Scripture.
‡ Estius, Rom. Cath.
§ Baumgarten on Acts xix. 1-36.
‖ Chrysostom on Rom. Dis. xi.
¶ Cyril, 4th Century, Institution ii.

VIII.

AS A SYMBOL OF REGENERATION.

Taught by Paul, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12--Alluded to in Titus ii. 5--Implied in Acts xix. 2, 3.

T. PAUL'S view of the Christian life, throughout the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of Romans, is that it consists of a death and a resurrection; the new-made Christian dies to sin, to the world, to the flesh, and to the Law; this death he undergoes at his first entrance into communion with Christ, and it is both typified and realized when he is buried beneath the baptismal waters. But no sooner is he thus dead with Christ, than he rises with Him; he is made partaker of Christ's resurrection; he is united to Christ's body; he lives in Christ and to Christ; he is no longer in the flesh, but in the Spirit.* In Romans vi. 4, there is a plain allusion to the ancient custom of baptism by immersion; and I agree with Koppe and Rosenmuller, that there is reason to regret it should have been abandoned

* Conybeare and Howson, Vol. II. p. 170.

in most Christian Churches, especially as it has so evidently a reference to this mystic sense of baptism.* Indeed, this passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism *was* by immersion.† For we assuredly believe that Paul did not understand the use of a figure in writing, if he made sprinkling to represent burial.‡ The Germans call baptism *taufi*, from depth, which they call *tief* in their language; as if it were proper those should be deeply immersed, who are baptized. And truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required; for it signifies that our native character, which is full of sin, entirely of flesh and blood as it is, may be *overwhelmed* by divine grace. The mode of baptism, therefore, ought to answer to the signification of baptism, so that it may show forth a sign that is certain and full§—the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent His resurrection to the life of right-

* Dr. Bloomfield, Recens. Synop. on Rom. vi. 4.

† Conybeare and Howson, Vol. II. p. 169.

‡ Dr. G. Stanhope, Rom. vi. 4.

§ Martin Luther Opera, Tom. I., fol. 72.

cousness.* For he that is immersed in water, which has the power of suffocating, is considered as in a state of death; and likewise as long as he continues immersed he is there buried. But when he rises out of the water, he rises as it were, from a state of death, and begins to live afresh. Of what *kind* this newness of life is, baptism also at the same time distinctly represents. For as water has the power of washing and purifying, it signifies that, in virtue of our Lord's death, the person baptized is cleansed from sin, and that he ought to live a new and pure life.† And it is impossible to see this significant act, in which the convert goes down into the water, travel-worn and soiled with dust, disappear for one moment, and then emerge pure and fresh, without feeling that the symbol answers to, and interprets a strong craving of, the human heart. It is the desire to wash away that which is past and evil.‡ Hence I repeat, the learned have rightly reminded us that, on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of immersion ought to have been retained in the Christian Church.§ For, in

* Conybeare, Life of Paul, Vol. I., p. 438.

† Rosenmuller Expl. Epis. ad Eph. in c. iv. 5.

‡ F. W. Robertson, Sermons, 1st Series, p. 137.

§ Rosenmuller as above.

sprinkling the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost.* A little water on the face may suffice to represent *a* washing, yet it cannot be thought to represent such *an entire* washing as baptism may seem to have been intended for—while the *new birth* of a believer is more express in immersion. For the believer being plunged in the water of baptism, is buried with Jesus Christ, as the apostle expresses it; and coming out of the water quits the tomb with his Saviour, and more perfectly represents the mystery of Jesus Christ who regenerates Him. † This solemn and interesting observance, then, puts forward high claims on the understanding and conscience of every Christian. ‡ For what greater shame can there be, than for a man to profess himself a Christian man because he is baptized, and yet he knoweth not what baptism is, nor what the dipping in the water doth betoken? §

* Rheinhard Ethics, Vol. V. p. 79.

† Dr. Towerson, Sac. Bap. part 3, pp. 51, 57.

‡ E. Bickersteth, on Bap. p. 20.

§ Archb. Cranmer, in Sermon on Bap. Ded. to King Edward VI., of Eng.

IX.

AS PREFIGURED AT THE RED SEA.

"Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.

THE passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea wonderfully agrees with our baptism, and represents the grace it was designed to express. For as in baptism, when performed in the primitive manner, by immersion and emersion, the persons baptized are overwhelmed, so in the Mosaic baptism we have an IMMERSION and an *emersion;* THAT, when they descended into the depths of the sea; *this*, when they went out and came to the opposite shore.* But this allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely; for neither did they enter the cloud nor were they wetted by the water of the sea. They passed under

* Turretine, Dispu., De Bap. Nubis et Maris, § 24.

both, as the baptized passes under water.* The cloud and the sea took the fathers out of sight, and restored them again to view, and this is what the water does to those who are baptized.† The cloud hung over the heads of the Israelites; and so the water is over those that are baptized. The sea surrounded them on each side; and so the water encompasses those that are baptized.‡

On the other hand, it appears necessary to add, that all attempts to render the type more perfect by means of trifling suppositions, such as that drops fell from the cloud on the Israelites, or that they were sprinkled by the sea, must be utterly discarded.§ 1. There is not the slightest intimation of this in the Old Testament. 2. The supposition is contrary to the very design of the cloud. It was not a natural cloud, but was a symbol of the Divine presence and protection. It was not to give rain on the Israelites, or on the land, but it was to guide, and be an emblem of the care of God. 3. It is doing violence to the Scriptures to introduce sup-

* Dean Alford, Gr. Test. 1 Cor. x. 2.
† Bengel's Gnomon, 1 Cor. x. 2.
‡ Grotius on 1 Cor. x. 2.
§ Olshausen on 1 Cor. x. 2.

positions in this manner without the slightest authority. The probability is, that the cloud extended over the whole camp of Israel, and that to those at a distance it *appeared* as a pillar.* This appearance of the Divine presence was various, but it is uniformly spoken of as itself one—a lofty column rising toward heaven. By day it would seem to have expanded as it rose, and spread itself as a kind of shade or curtain between the Israelites and the sun, as the Lord is said by it to have 'spread a cloud for a covering,' while by night it exchanged the cloudy for the illumined form, and diffused throughout the camp a pleasant light.† They were baptized unto Moses then thus: they had him as their leader in the type of baptism; for the type was this, the being *under* the cloud, and the *passing through* the sea.‡ The cloud and the sea did for them, in reference to Moses, what baptism does for us in reference to Christ.§ They had fellowship with Moses both in the shadow under the cloud, and in the through-passing of the sea; for beholding him going

* Dr. Albert Barnes, 1 Cor. x. 2.

† Dr. Fairbairn, Typol. of Scrip., p. 98.

‡ Dr. Bloomfield, Crit. Dig., vol. vi., p. 478.

§ Hodge on 1 Cor. x. 1–3.

through first, they themselves also dared the waters; as also with us, Christ having first died and risen, we ourselves also are baptized, imitating His death through the immersion, and His resurrection through the emersion.* And this is the only point of analogy between the cases, and it is all the apostle's argument requires.† Is it asked then—How were the Israelites baptized in the cloud and in the sea, seeing they were neither immersed—literally—in the sea, nor wetted by the cloud?‡ It is answered—Under the conduct of Moses they received baptism in *figura*, by passing *under* the cloud and *through* the sea.§ When the floods stood upright like walls, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea, Jehovah led His redeemed children into the depths of the waters, and buried them in baptism, in the sea and thick covering cloud. He raised them up again, also, and guided them by His strength into His holy habitation.‖ Hence it is concluded that the going down of the Israelites into the bottom and

* Dr. Bloomfield as above.

† Hodge as above.

‡ Witsius Œcon. Fœd. liv., c. 10, § 11.

§ Douay Test. Rom. Cath., 1 Cor. x. 2.

‖ Weiss, (a converted Jew) on Old Test. Scrip.

middle of the sea, and their coming up from thence to dry ground, have a great agreement with the rite of Christian baptism, as it was administered in the first times.*

* Gataker, Adv. Miscel., c. iv.

X.

AS PREFIGURED BY THE ARK.

1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

THE water of baptism is here called the antitype to the water of the flood, because the flood was a type or emblem of baptism in the three following particulars: 1. As by building the Ark and *entering into it*, Noah showed his strong faith in the promise of God concerning his preservation by the very water which was to destroy the antediluvians for their sins, so by giving ourselves to be *buried in* the water of baptism, we show a like faith in God's promise, that though we die and are buried, He will save us from death, the punishment of sin, by raising us from the dead at the last day. 2. As the *preserving* of Noah alive during the nine months he was in the flood, is an emblem of the *preservation* of the souls of believers while in the state of the dead, so the *preserving* believers alive while buried in the

waters of baptism, is a prefiguration of the same event. 3. As the water of the deluge destroyed the wicked antediluvians, but preserved Noah by bearing up the Ark in which he was shut up till the waters were assuaged, and he went out of it to live again upon the earth, so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both these events: the death of the sinner it prefigures by *burying* the baptized persons in the water; and the salvation of the righteous, by *raising* the baptized person out of the water to live a new life.* There is, also, a great analogy between salvation by the Ark and that by baptism, inasmuch as the one did *represent* and the other *doth exhibit* Christ Himself.†

* Macknight on 1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

† Dr. Owen on same.

XI.

AS ILLUSTRATED BY DIVERS BAPTISMS.

Hebrews vi. 2.

DIAPHOROUS BAPTISMOUS, the Apostle calls *divers baptisms*, that is, various immersions.* And whoever considers the number of unclean persons who daily had need of washing, and he who reads the Talmudic treatises concerning purifications, and collections of water convenient for these purposes, will be easily persuaded that Bethesda and other pools at Jerusalem subserved this design.† Indeed, under the law, there were, as the Apostle speaks, divers baptisms.‡ For the history of Israel and the Law of Moses abound with such lustrations.§ In the Levitical ritual many baptisms, or immersions of the body in the water, were enjoined, as emblematical of

* Dr. J. Alting, Com. on Heb., p. 260.

† D'Outreenius.

‡ Josiah Conder, Esq.

§ Smith's Bib. Dic., Art. Bap.

that purity of mind, which is necessary to the worshiping of God acceptably.* Aaron and his sons, on their being consecrated to the priesthood, were to be *wholly* washed with *water*, as well as sprinkled with *blood* at the door of the tabernacle. Ex. xxix. 4, 21. And for cleansing from various ceremonial uncleanness, also, the Israelites were directed to wash *themselves*. Lev. xiii. 54–58; xiv. 8, 9; xvi. 4, 24; xxii. 6. Now Christians are a *royal priesthood*, and they have an initiatory washing, the ordinance of baptism to consecrate them to their high and holy office.† And as the Jews were ceremonially purified, so Christians are emblematically washed by the purifying waters of baptism.‡ Thus we have a further instruction on baptism in the *washings appointed* by the law of Moses.§ For the baptisms with the Jews were not by sprinkling, but in addition to washing the whole body, an entire immersion.‖ They bathed themselves all over.¶ Having come from the market, where among a crowd of men, they might

* Dr. Macknight, Com. on Heb. vi. 2.

† E. Bickersteth on Bap., pp. 6, 7.

‡ Webster and Wilkinson, Diaph. Bap., Heb. vi.

§ E. Bickersteth as above.

‖ Stack, His. Bap., p. 8.

¶ Vatablus, Prof. of Heb., Paris, on Mark vii. 4.

have come in contact with unclean persons, they eat not without having first bathed themselves, Mark vii. 4, which is not to be understood of the washing of the hands, as interpreted by Lightfoot and Wetstein,† but of immersing, which the word always means in the Classics and the New Testament.* The other ordinary lustrations of the Jews were performed in the same way.* For by the Hebrew canons, all that are unclean, whether men or vessels, are not cleansed but by dipping or baptizing in water.‡ And wherever in the law washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means *nothing else* than dipping of the whole body in a laver; for if a man dips himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness. A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in the pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of skin? He must dip them and lift them out by the fringes.§ And upon whatsoever any of them

* Dr. H. A. W. Meyer, Manual on Mark and Luke.

† Schneckenberger, from Jewish Talmud. See Adkins, p. 10

‡ Ainsworth, on Lev. xi. 32.

§ Rabbi Maimonides, Hilchot. Mikvaal, c. I. § 2.

(unclean animals) doth fall, it shall be unclean, whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done, it *must be put into water*, and it shall be unclean until even: so it shall be cleansed.* And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of tables.†

Hence the reason why Christ prescribed immersion in baptism, from which the several figures found in the New Testament are taken, seems to have been that some of His first followers were already accustomed to religious washings of this kind; especially the Jews who had been used to Levitical washings.‡ And the symbolical signification of the rite of baptism was so intelligible that as soon as the Jews saw John practice it, they understood what he meant by it.§

* Lev. xi. 32.
† Mark vii. 4.
‡ Storr and Flatt, Bib. Theo., p. 216. Ward's Ed.
§ Olshausen, Com. on John i. 26, 27.

XII.

AS THE DOOR TO THE LOCAL CHURCH.

Regeneration admits to the Spiritual Church—baptism to the local organization—One being the silent and unseen death to sin, and resurrection to life—the other a public burial with Christ, and rising with Him to walk in newness of life. The invisible Church has no ordinances—the visible has two—The Lord's Baptism and Supper.

BAPTISM is God's initiatory rite to the external privileges of religion. This was God's door into His sacred Sanctuary. Without undergoing this rite no person, old or young, can scripturally and properly be identified with the congregation of the Lord, nor be canonically entitled to its religious privileges.* It was necessary that some mark should be devised by which the follower of Christ might be distinguished, and by consenting to bear which he might give proof of his loyalty. Some initiatory rite was necessary,

* Thorn, on Inf. Bap., pp. 550-562.

some public formality, in which the new volunteer might take, as it were, the military oath and confess his Chief before men. If such a ceremony could be devised, which should at the same time indicate that the new votary had taken upon himself not merely a new service, but an entirely new mode of life, it would be so much the better. Now there was already in use among the Jews the rite of baptism—and it had acquired a meaning and associations, which were universally understood (See page 49). This ceremony, then, Christ adopted, and He made it absolutely binding upon all His followers to submit to it.* Our Lord's own Commission conjoins the making of disciples with their baptism. And the conduct of the Apostles is the plainest comment on both; for so soon as ever men, convinced by their preaching, asked for guidance and direction, their first exhortation was to repentance and baptism, that thus the convert should be at once publicly received into the fold of Christ.† And if any be so impudent as to say, it is not the meaning of Christ, that baptizing should immediately, without delay, follow discipling, they are con-

* Ecce Homo, pp. 95, 96.

† Smith's Bib. Dic. Am. Ed. p. 236.

futed by the constant example of Scripture.* Then they that gladly received His word were baptized; and *the same day* there were added unto them about three thousand souls.† Thus the Sacrament of baptism was regarded as the door of entrance into the Christian Church, and was held to be so indispensable that it could not be omitted even in the case of St. Paul—who although he had been called to the apostleship by the direct intervention of Christ Himself, yet he was commanded to receive baptism at the hands of a simple disciple.‡ Hence how excellent soever any man's character is, he must be baptized before he can be looked upon as completely a member of the church of Christ.§ And what man dare go in a way which hath neither precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that hath a full current of both? Yet they that will admit members into the visible church without baptism, do so.‖ In vain too, should we argue that we may institute other rites and ceremonies.¶ For one baptism is

* Baxter's Plain Scrip. Proof, p. 126.

† Acts ii. 41.

‡ Conybeare and Howson, Vol. I. p. 438.

§ Dr. P. Doddridge, Lectures, p. 508.

‖ Baxter's Plain Scrip. Proof, p. 24.

¶ Dr. King on Presb. Ch. Gov. p. 20.

spoken of, as also one faith, because of the doctrine respecting the *initiation*, being one in all the church, which has been taught to baptize with invocation of the Trinity, and to symbolize the Lord's death and resurrection by the sinking down and coming up.*

* Anonymous.

XIII.

AS RELATED TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Both ordinances of the Church, 1 Cor. ii. 2.—One is initiative, Acts ii. 41.—The other commemorative, 1 Cor. ii. 24, 25.—Baptism then is prerequisite, Acts ii. 42, 46.

BEFORE entering upon the argument before us, it is but just to remark that in one principle the Baptist and Pedobaptist churches agree. They both agree in rejecting from the communion of the table of the Lord, and denying the rights of church fellowship to all who have not been baptized. Valid baptism the Baptists consider essential to constitute visible church membership. This also we hold. The *only* question, then, that here divides us is, What is essential to valid baptism? The Baptists, in passing the sentence of disfranchisement upon all other Christian churches, have only acted upon a principle held in common with all other Christian churches, viz., that baptism is essential to church membership. According to their views of baptism they certainly are consistent in restricting

thus their communion. And herein they act upon the same principle as other churches, *i. e.*, they admit only those whom they deem baptized persons to the communion table. Of course they must be their own judges as to what baptism is. It is evident that according to our views of baptism, we can admit them to our communion; but with their views of baptism, it is equally evident they can never reciprocate the courtesy. And the charge of *close communion* is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us, inasmuch as church fellowship with them is determined by as liberal principles as it is with any other Protestant churches; so far, I mean, as the present subject is concerned.* Did we hold that only believers who have been immersed are baptized we should practice strict communion, and we should almost regard it an insult to be required to give it up without a change of views on the subject of baptism. We as Pedobaptists are also 'close communionists,' and we hope we shall never cease to be be such. The *only legitimate* subject of controversy between us and the Baptists, are the *subjects* and *mode* of *baptism*.† Open communion

* Dr. Hibbard, (Methodist), on Bap., part 2, p. 174.

† Editor Congregationalist Journal.

is an absurdity when it means communion with the unbaptized. I would not for a moment consider a proposition to admit an unbaptized person to the communion, and can I ask a Baptist so to stultify himself and ignore his own doctrine, as to ask me to commune with him, while he believes I am unbaptized? Let us have unity indeed, but not at the expense of principle, and let us not ask the Baptist to ignore, or be inconsistent with, his own doctrine. Neither let us make an outcry at his 'close communion,' which is but faithfulness to principle, until we are prepared to be open communionists ourselves, from which stupidity may we be forever preserved.* Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized.† It is certain that Christians in *general* have always been spoken of, by the most ancient fathers, as baptized persons; and it is also certain, that as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity reaches, no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper.‡ But it was limited strictly to "those who had

* Am. Presbyterian.

† Dr. Wall, (Episcopal), Hist. Inf. Bap., Part 2, ch. 9.

‡ Dr. Philip Doddridge, (Cong.), Lectures, p. 511.

embraced the gospel, and had been baptized into the faith of Christ." For looking upon the Lord's Supper as the highest and most solemn act of religion, they thought they could *never take care enough* in the dispensing of it.* It is, therefore, an *indispensable* qualification for this ordinance that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible church of Christ in *full* standing—and by this I intend that he should be a man of piety, that he should have made a public profession of religion, and that he should have been baptized†—because baptism is the first among the sacraments, and the door of the sacraments.‡ I agree, then, with the advocates of close communion in two points: 1. That baptism is the initiatory ordinance which introduces into the visible church; of course, where there is no baptism, there are no visible churches. 2. That we ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and of course, are not church members, even if we regard them as Christians.§ Hence if I believed with the Baptists, that none are baptized but those who are

* Dr. Cave, Prim. Chr'ty, part I., ch. xi., p. 333.

† Dr. Dwight's Syst. Theol., Ser. 160, B. S. ch. 4, sec. 7.

‡ Bonaventure, Apud, Forbesium, Inst. Historic Theol. Lib. x., Cap. IV., sec. 9.

§ Dr. Griffin, Letter on Bap., cited by Curtis, p. 125.

immersed on profession of faith, then I should with them refuse to commune with any others.*

We have then arrived at the conclusion that all, without exception or limitation, all who repent and believe, and are baptized, *and only they*, are fit subjects for the Lord's Supper.† That baptism was *always* precedent to the Lord's Supper, and none were admitted to receive the eucharist till they were baptized. This is so obvious to every man that it needs no proof; if any one doubts it, he may find it clearly asserted in the Second Apology of Justin Martyr, p. 97.‡

Then, as to *open communionism*.—Let men pretend what they can for such a *hotch-potch* communion in their churches, I steadfastly believe the event and issue of such practices will, sooner or later, convince all gainsayers, that it neither pleaseth Christ, nor is any way promotive of true or gospel holiness in the churches of God's people. I shall never be reconciled to that *charity*, which, in pretence of *peace* and *moderation*, opens the Church's door to church-disjointing principles.§

* Dr. John Hall, (Presb.).

† Am. Tract Society, Duty of the Pious Inquirer, p. 3.

‡ Peter King, Lord High Chancellor of Eng., Prim. Ch., p. 196.

§ By an Independent on the Sin and danger of admitting Anabaptists to the Congregational Communion, &c.

XIV.

AS TO ITS NATURE FROM BAPTIZO.

THE term baptism is derived from the Greek word *bapto*, from which term is formed *baptizo*.* It signifies *generally* an immersion of *whatever kind*, and done on *whatever occasion*. But when this name was employed to designate the great initiatory rite of the Christian religion, and more especially when the habit was firmly established of speaking of this rite, as *ho baptisma* (*the* baptism), this term, however wide and various the application of it may have previously been, never suggested the idea of any other dipping than that which took place at the ministration of this sacrament.† The primary signification of the original then is to dip, to plunge, immerse.‡ Still, some may be disposed to consider this as not altogether certain. They may perhaps maintain, that the idea of *bap*—

* Coleman's Ancient Christianity, p. 372.
† Dr. Chalmers' Inst. Theol. on Rom. vi. 4.
‡ Coleman, as above.

the original etymological root of the verbs—was *to tinge, dye,* or *color;* and that the idea of *plunging* or *dipping* was derived from this, because, in order to accomplish the work of dyeing, the act of plunging or dipping was necessary. But, as the idea of *plunging* or *immersing* is common to both the words *bapto* and *baptizo*, while that of *dyeing* or *coloring* belongs only to *bapto*, it would seem altogether probable, that the former signification is the more usual and natural one, and, therefore, more probably the *original* one.

In the New Testament, there is one other marked distinction between the use of these verbs. *Baptizo* and its derivatives are exclusively employed, *when the rite of baptism is to be designated* in any form whatever; and in this case, *bapto* seems to be purposely, as well as habitually, excluded.* Why? The verb *baptizo* has only one acceptation. It literally and perpetually signifies to plunge.† It is not, like this latter word, used to designate the idea of *coloring* or *dyeing.*‡ The distinctive characteristic of the institution of baptism is then, *immer-*

* Prof. Moses Stuart on Bap. Nashville Ed., pp. 13-51.
† Stourdza, Alex. De, Russian State Councillor.
‡ Prof. M. Stuart, p. 51.

sion, baptisma, which cannot be omitted without destroying the mysterious sense of the sacrament, and contradicting, at the same time, the etymological signification of the word which serves to designate it. Baptism and immersion are, therefore, identical, and to say: *baptism* by *aspersion*, is as if one should say, *immersion* by *aspersion*, or any other absurdity of the same nature.* The word corresponds, in signification, with the German *taufen*, to sink in the deep.† Thus we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients; for they immersed the whole body in water.‡ Yet I have heard a disputant, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word, rendered in the New Testament, *baptizo*, means more properly to *sprinkle* than to plunge; and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former method was the earliest, and for many centuries the most general practice in baptizing. But one who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments,

* Alex. De Stourdza, as above.

† Brenner, Rom. Cath.

‡ John Calvin, on John iii. 23.

and sometimes better, yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood even in support of the truth.* No scholar could, without injury to his reputation, give the signification to sprinkle to baptizo.† As, *to purify*: the theory is very beautiful, but it wants bottom.‡ Never, even in a solitary instance, have we encountered it in the sense of purification.§

CONSTRUED WITH PREPOSITIONS.

Baptizo, construed with the preposition *eis*, is to immerse *into*. *Into* being the *original* and *proper* signification of the preposition,¶ after verbs of motion of any kind.** Hence to prefer a different meaning, appears very like going out of one's way to serve a purpose.††

En is, in accordance with the meaning of *baptizo*, (immerse), not to be understood instrumentally (as by or with), but on the contrary as

* Dr. G. Campbell of Scotland, Lec. on Pulp. Eloq., p. 480.
† Prof. Chas, Anthon (Episcopal).
‡ Prof. M. Stuart, Bap. Bal.
§ Prof. Wilson (Presb.). on Bap., p. 184.
‖ Dr. E. Robinson, N. T. Greek Lexicon.
¶ Dr. Dwight, on Matt. xxviii. 19.
** Prof. Wilson on Bap., p. 330.
†† Meyer, Corn. Matt. iii. 11.

in, in the sense of the element *wherein* the immersion takes place.*

While *ek* strictly and properly contemplates the point of departure *as within* the object denoted by its regimen. This is demonstrated by our more philosophical grammarians, and ably maintained by Dr. Carson.†

Our Saviour, therefore, when He was baptized, first went down *into* the *river*, was plunged *into* the *water*, and afterwards came up *out* of it. And it is written (Acts viii. 38, 39), that Philip *went down* with the eunuch *into* the *water*, and there baptized him; and it is added that the ordinance being administered, they both came *up out of the water*.‡ Thus the act of baptizing is something quite distinct from either the *going down into the water*, or *the coming up out of it*. *Both* went down and *both* came up, but *one only* was baptized.§

* Anonymous.

† Prof. Wilson, p. 169.

‡ Quenstedius, Antiq. Bib., Par. 1, c, iv, Sec. 2.

§ Anonymous.

DEFINITIONS OF BAPTIZO.

1. *Baptizo*, to immerse, to dip, TROMMIUS.
2. To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink, GREENFIELD.
3. To dip, to immerse, or plunge in water. PARKHURST.
4. To merge, immerse, to wash, to bathe. SCHOETTGEN.
5. To plunge under, or overwhelm in water, STEPHANUS.
6. To merge, or immerse, to submerge, or bury in water, STEPHENS.
7. Properly it means to dip, or immerse in water. STOCKIUS.
8. To dip, to immerse as we do anything for the purpose of dyeing it, SCAPULA.
9. To dip repeatedly, LIDDELL AND SCOTT.
10. To baptize is to plunge, WETSTEIN.
11. To baptize signifies only to immerse, not to wash, except by consequence, ALSTIDIUS.
12. Baptism is an entire action to wit, a dipping, MELANCTHON.
13. To baptize, to merge, to bathe, SCHREVELLIUS.
14. To immerse repeatedly into liquid, to submerge, to soak thoroughly, to saturate, DONNEGAN.
15. The proper signification of baptizo is to immerse, plunge under, overwhelm in water, ZANCHIUS.
16. To baptize, immerse into water, dip, bathe, SCHINDLER.
17. To plunge, to immerse, submerge, PROF. ROST.
18. *Baptizo*, I plunge, I plunge into water, dip, baptize, bury, overwhelm, DR. JOHN JONES.
19. The native and proper signification of baptize is to dip into water, or to plunge under water, LEIGH.
20. The Baptists have the advantage of us. Baptism signifies a total immersion, PROF. PORSON.
21. GUIDO FABRICIUS, To baptize, dip, bathe.

XV.

AS CORROBORATED IN HISTORY.

IN the Apostolic age, and some time after, before churches and baptisteries were generally erected, they baptized in any place where they had conveniences, as John baptized in Jordan, and Philip baptized the eunuch in the wilderness, and Paul the jailer in his own house.* But afterwards they had *baptisteria*, or, as we call them, fonts, built at first near the church, then in the church porch, to represent baptism's being the entrance into the church. Afterwards they were placed in the Church itself. They were usually very large and capacious, not only that they might comport with the general custom of those times of persons baptized being immersed, or put under water, but because the stated times of baptism returning so seldom, great multitudes were usually baptized at the same time.† It is evi-

* Bingham, Orig. Eccle., Vol. I., b. 8, c. 7.

† Dr. Cave, Prim. Chris., p. 1, c. 18.

dent, then, that during the first ages of the Church, and for many centuries afterwards, the practice of immersion prevailed: and which seems indeed never to be departed from, except where it was administered to a person at the point of death, or upon the bed of sickness—which was considered as not giving the full privileges of baptism.* This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that as one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the anti-pedobaptists merely for the use of dipping; when it was in all probability the way by which our blessed Saviour, and for certain, was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. 'Tis a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is *certainly true, and may be proved so.*† For we read, not in Scripture, that baptism was otherwise administered than by plunging; and we are able to make it appear by the acts of Councils, and by the ancient rituals, that for

* Encyclo. Ecclesiastica, Art. Bap.

† Dr. Wall, His. Inf. Bap., Vol. ii. p. 341.

thirteen hundred years baptism was thus administered throughout the whole Church as far as it was possible.* Indeed, we have only to go back six or eight hundred years, and immersion was the only mode, except in case of the few baptized on beds when death was near. And with regard to such cases, it disqualified its recipient for holy orders in case he recovered. Immersion was not only universal six or eight hundred years ago, but it was primitive and apostolic, no case of baptism standing on record by any other mode for the first three hundred years, except the few cases of those baptized clinically. If any one practice of the early church is clearly established it is immersion.† The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the Fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them. But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti, 'a thing made out, viz., the ancient practice of immersion.' So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times, which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is

* Bishop Bossuet, from Stennet *vs.* Russen, p. 175.

† Bishop Smith of Epis. Ch. Kentucky, from Bliss' Letters on Bap. p. 24.

possible for any candid man who examines the subject, to deny this.* For there can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was a complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters, and that, for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown or else regarded as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case.† And it is well known that all the Greek and Oriental churches, with a population of one hundred millions, though adopting the baptism of children, retain immersion to this day, as essential to the validity of the rite, and as Bunsen remarks, deny that there is any efficacy in the Western Roman Catholic—form of baptism.‡

As to the question of fact then the testimony is ample and decisive. No matter of Church History is clearer. The evidence is all one way; and all church historians of any repute agree in accepting it. We cannot claim even originality in teaching it in a Congregational Seminary. And we really feel guilty of a kind of anachronism in writing an article to insist upon it.

* Prof. M. Stuart on Bap., p 23. Goodwyn & Co's. Ed.

† London Quarterly Review, from Everts' Law of Bap., p. 43

‡ New Am. Encyclopedia, Art. Bap.

It is a point on which Ancient, Mediæval and Modern Historians alike, Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinist, have no controversy. And the simple reason for this unanimity is that the statements of the early Fathers are so clear, and the light shed upon these statements from the early customs of the church is so conclusive, that no historian who cares for his reputation would dare to deny it, and no historian who is worthy of the name would wish to. There are some historical questions concerning the early church on which the most learned writers disagree, for example, the question of infant baptism, but on this one of the early practice of immersion the most distinguished Antiquarians, such as Bingham, Augusti, (Coleman), Smith (Dictionary of the Bible), and Historians, such as Mosheim, Gieseler, Hase, Neander, Milman, Schaff, Alzog (Catholic), hold a common language. The following extract from Coleman's Antiquities, very accurately expresses what all agree to. "In the primitive church, immersion was undeniably the common mode of baptism. The utmost that can be said of *sprinkling* in that early period is that it was, in case of necessity, permitted as an exception to a general rule. This fact is so well established

that it were needless to adduce authorities in proof of it." As one further illustration we quote from Schaff's "Apostolic Church:" "As to the outward *mode* of administering this ordinance, immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form." But while immersion was the universal custom, an abridgement of the rite was freely allowed and defended in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death, and the peculiar form of sprinkling thus came to be known as "clinical" baptism, or the baptism of the sick. It is somewhat significant that no controversy of any account ever arose in the church on this question of the form of baptism, down to the Reformation. And hence it is difficult to determine with complete accuracy just when immersion gave way to sprinkling as the common church practice. The two forms were employed, one as the rule, the other as the exception, until as Christianity traveled northward into a colder climate, the exception silently grew to be the rule.

As late as the thirteenth century immersion still held its ground, as is shown by a passage in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, where the arguments in favor of the two modes

of baptism are compared, and the conclusion is drawn that immersion is the *safer* because the more *common* form (quia hoc habet communion usus). Three centuries later, in the time of the Reformers, sprinkling has become common, and even quite universal; though Calvin speaks of the different forms of baptism in a way which seems to imply that immersion was by no means obsolete. So that Dr. Schaff puts the date quite early enough, we think, when he says that "not till the end of the thirteenth century did sprinkling become the rule and immersion the exception." It is to be remarked also that this change occurred only in the Western or Latin church. In the Greek church immersion has remained the rule to the present day.*

* Prof. L. L. Paine, D.D., Christian Mirror, Aug. 30, 1875.

XVI.

AS PERVERTED INTO A SAVING ORDINANCE.

BAPTISM supposeth regeneration sure in itself first. Sacraments are never administered to begin or to work grace. Read all the Acts, still it is said: They *believed* and were baptized.* And in the *first two centuries* no one was baptized, except, being instructed in the faith, and acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, he was *able* to profess himself a *believer*.† But the original simplicity of the office of baptism had, in the *third* century, undergone some *corruption*. The symbol had been gradually exalted at the expense of the thing signified; and the spirit of the ceremony was *beginning* to be lost in the form. Hence a belief was gaining ground among the converts, and was inculcated among the heathen, that the act of baptism gave remission

* Dr. Goodwin's Works, Vol. I., Part I., p. 200.

† Salmasius and Suicerus.

of all sins committed previously.* This was one of the *first departures* of the Church from the sacred truths of the gospel, and to this *vital error* may be traced much of that *ignorance of spiritual things*, and that intellectual gloom which covered the church in the dark ages of papal supremacy.† This opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism arose from a wrong understanding of our Lord's words: Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.‡ Thus in the old ecclesiastical writers we find many extravagant and unscriptural assertions respecting the effect of baptism,§ *e. g.*, that although a man should be foul with every human vice, the blackest that can be named, yet should he fall into the baptismal pool, he ascends from the divine waters purer than the beams of noon.‖ That no person comes to the kingdom of heaven, but by the sacrament of baptism.¶ And Cyril of Alex-

* Waddington, Hist. Church, Ch. II. p. 53.

† Rev. William Phillips, M. E. in Campbellism Exposed, p. 18.

‡ Suicerus from Pedob. Exam. Vol. ii., p. 129.

§ Knapp's Clin. Theol., p. 488.

‖ Chrysostom (398), from Isaac Taylor's Anc. Chr'ty, Vol. I. p. 236.

¶ Ambrose, A. D., 390.

andria went so far as to say that the water became changed, by the divine power in the Holy Spirit, into an entirely different element. In fact among the old Catholic fathers of the Christian church there always prevailed very high ideas respecting the necessity and advantages of baptism. And there are not wanting incautious expressions on this subject even among some Protestant theologians,*—for instance, that with the water of baptism the grace of regeneration, the seed of the Holy Ghost, the principle of a higher existence, is committed to the soul; that it grows with us as an innate impression of our being. And as long as the believer trusts to his baptism as the source of spiritual life all is well.† That by baptism, we who were by nature children of wrath, *are made the children of God.* And this regeneration is more than barely being admitted into the church. By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated, or born again. And if infants are guilty of original sin, in the *ordinary way*, they cannot be saved, unless this be *washed away by baptism.*‡ That baptism wrests the

* Knapp, Theol. as above.

† Rev. Wm. Harness, of St. Pancrass Chapel, London, on Bap. Reg., pp. 135-138.

‡ John Wesley, founder of Methodism. Preservative, p. 146. Pub. by Am. Gen. Conference.

keys of the heart out of the hands of the strong man armed, that the possession may be surrendered to Him whose right it is.*

Now these assertions clearly make baptism a saving ordinance; and I know not that any Papist ever used stronger language in pointing out its importance.† But a more fatal mistake there cannot be than to attribute to baptism that change of which it is only the appointed sign in the Christian church. It is lamentable beyond expression, that professed Protestants should require to be combated with the same weapons precisely as those employed against the worst errors of Romanism. But so it must be, while the pestilence of Roman heresy lurks within the precincts of a *Reformed* church. As the outward sign of inward cleansing by the grace and Spirit of Christ, baptism is a most significant and instructive ordinance; but those who would confound, or even identify it with the renewing of the Holy Ghost, have quitted the doctrine of the Apostle, and substituted in its place a mere human invention. It is one thing to affirm that Christ has enjoined baptism

* Matthew Henry, Treatise on Bap., pp. 12, &c.

† Rev. W. Phillips, as above, p. 19.

as an initiatory rite of His kingdom; it is quite another thing, and an error of the most formidable dimensions, to assert that all baptized persons are born of the Spirit.*

* Dr. J. Morrison, Hom. for the Times, pp. 265, 342, 343.

XVII.

AS UNSCRIPTURALLY APPLIED TO INFANTS.

ACCORDING to its true, original design baptism can be given only to adults, who are capable of true knowledge, repentance and faith.* It is not to be received then any more than faith by right of inheritance.† Hence Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants.‡ It is totally opposed to the spirit of the apostolic age, and to the fundamental principles of the New Testament.§ The passages from Scripture cited in favor of infant baptism as a usage of the primitive Church, are doubtful and prove nothing.‖ There is absolutely not a *single trace* of it to be found in the New Testament. There are passages that may be reconciled with it, if the practice can only be proved to have existed; but there is not

* Prof. Hahn's Theol., p. 556.
† Dr. Pressense, Apos. Era, p. 376.
‡ Dr. Hanna.
§ Prof. Lange, Inf. Bap., p. 101.
‖ Hagenbach's His. Doct., pp. 190-193.

R. J. LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST

one word which asserts its existence."* Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infants.† Lydia's household, I know, has been adduced in proof of the apostolic authority of infant baptism; but there is no proof here that any except adults were baptized.‡ Baptism ensued in this case, without doubt, merely upon profession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah. But for that very reason it is highly improbable that her house should be understood as including infant children.§ We cannot, indeed, prove that the apostles ordained infant baptism from those places where the baptism of a whole family is mentioned.‖ In none of these instances has it been proved that there were little children among them.¶ And we do freely confess there is neither express precept nor precedent in the New Testament for the baptism of infants.**

How unwary, too, are many excellent men, in contending for infant baptism on the ground

* North Brit. Review (Presb.), Aug. 1852.
† Dr. Wall, His. Inf. Bap. Intro., pp. 1, 55.
‡ Dr. De Wette, Com. on Acts xvi. 15.
§ Olshausen, Com. on Acts xvi. 14, 15.
‖ Neander's Planting and Training, p. 162, N. Y. Ed.
¶ Kitto's Bib. Ency., Art. Bap.
** Fuller, Infant's Advoc., pp. 71, 159.

of the Jewish analogy of circumcision. *Numberless difficulties* present themselves in our way as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this. The Covenant of Circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism.* Indeed—what is the Covenant? What meaning and force has it? Here we have never agreed, and do not now. The Baptists have pushed us for an answer—we have given them many answers,—but never any single answer in which we could agree among ourselves.† In fact, the New Testament saints have nothing more to do with the Abrahamic covenant than the Old Testament believers who lived prior to Abraham.‡ And the sacraments of the *New* Covenant are of such a nature as to seal nothing but what is *spiritual*, nor to be of any advantage, except in regard to those who really believe in Jesus Christ.§ This is the great reason why we cannot believe that baptism was administered in the apostolic age to little children.‖ Thus, all attempts to make out infant baptism from the New Testament

* Prof. Moses Stuart, Com. on O. T., chap. 22, and Lec. on Gal.

† Bushnell's Views of Christian Nurture, pp. 56-61.

‡ Dr. E. Williams on Morrice' Social Religion, pp. 312-317.

§ Vitringa in Pedob. Exam., Vol. ii., p. 268.

‖ Dr. Pressense, as above.

fail.* No instance of it is recorded there: no allusion is made to its effects; no directions are given for its administration;† it is not brought down as a substitute for circumcision.‡ And from the action of Christ's blessing infants, to infer they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much, as that there is a want of better arguments.§ Indeed *all traces* of infant baptism which one will find in the New Testament *must first be put into it.*‖ And, where the Scripture is silent, who shall speak?¶

But, neither in the Scriptures, nor during the first hundred and fifty years (at least), is a sure example of infant baptism to be found; and we must conclude that the numerous opposers of it cannot be contradicted on gospel ground.** For the early and continued opposition to it would have been inexplicable, if it had been an undoubted apostolic institution.†† Though some, indeed, have argued that in the silence of Scrip-

* Prof. Lange, as above.

† Dr. Jacobi, Church of Eng. Eccle. Pol., pp. 270, 271.

‡ H. W. Beecher.

§ Bishop Taylor, Liberty of Prophecy, p. 230.

‖ Schleiermacher.

¶ Ambrose.

* Prof. Hahn, Theol., p. 556.

†† Meyer's Com. on Acts, Vol. ii., p. 235.

ture, it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is seen in the second century must have descended from the apostles; but the presumption is *wholly* the other way. History *confirms* the inference drawn from the sacred volume.* There is, I think, *no* trace of it until the last part of the second century, when a passage is found in Irenæus, which *may possibly*—and only possibly—refer to it. Nor is it anywhere *distinctly* mentioned before the time of Tertullian (204), who, while he testifies to the practice, was himself rather opposed to it.† A proof that the practice had not as yet come to be regarded as an Apostolical institution, for otherwise he would hardly have ventured to express himself so strongly against it.‡ As an established order of the Church, therefore, it belongs to the third century, when its use, and the mode of its administration, and the whole theory of it as a Christian ceremony, were necessarily moulded by the baptismal theology of the time.§ For an opinion prevailed that no one could be saved without being baptized;‖ which rule, they said,

* N. Brit. Review, as above.
† Dr. Jacobi, as above.
‡ Anonymous.
§ Dr. Jacobi, as above.
‖ Salmasius, Epis. Jus. Pac.

as it holds to all, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants, to whom our help and the Divine mercy is rather to be granted; because, by their weeping and wailing at their first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion.* It was, therefore, customary in the ancient Church, if infants were greatly afflicted, and in danger of death, or if parents were affected with a singular concern about the salvation of their children to present their infants, or children, in their minority, to the bishop to be baptized.† But nothing can be affirmed with certainty, concerning the custom of the Church before Tertullian, seeing there is not anywhere, in more ancient writers, that I know of, *undoubted* mention of infant baptism, though there were persons in his age who desired their infants might be baptized, especially when they were afraid of their dying without baptism; which opinion Tertullian opposed, and by so doing intimates that pedobaptism *began* to prevail.‡

In the *fourth century* its validity was generally

* Cyprian, A. D., 253.

† Vitringa, Observ. Sac., Vol. i., B. 2, ch. iv., sec. 9.

‡ Venema, Eccle. His., Vol. iii., ch. ii., secs. 108, 109.

acknowledged, although the Church fathers often found it necessary to *warn* against the delay of baptism.* The practice was neither uniformly adopted, nor always or everywhere observed. This is evident from numerous instances of persons living in or about the fourth century, who were not baptized till after they had reached the age of manhood. Such was the case with Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory; and among the Emperors, with Constantine, Constantius—sons of Constantine the Great,—Valentian, Gratian, Theodorus, and with innumerable other persons.† Augustine pointed out the removal of original sin, and the sins of the children as its definite object; and through his representations was its universal diffusion promoted.‡

In the *fifth and following* ages it was generally received.§ The baptism of infants is therefore named a tradition.‖ And this practice which Protestants have retained from the Romish church, without a due consideration of it, as well as many other things which they still re-

* Bretschneider, Theol., Vol. I., p. 469.

† Koraes, a Greek Scholar.

‡ Bretschneider, as above.

§ Curcellus, Instit. Rel. Christ., L. I., c. 12.

‖ Dr. Field, on the Church, p. 375.

tain, renders their baptism very defective. It corrupts both the institution and ancient usage of it, and the relation it ought to have to faith, repentance and regeneration.* And, it must be confessed that without the authority of the Church, the baptism of children could not be adequately defended. For there is no example in its favor in the Sacred Scriptures; which appear, besides water, to demand faith also. Hence, it appears to me, that those who reject Church authority, cannot sustain the attacks of the Anabaptists.† For wise men do easily observe that the Anabaptists can, by the same probability of Scripture, enforce a necessity of communicating infants (*i. e.* administering the Lord's Supper to them) upon us, as we do of baptizing infants upon them, if we speak of immediate divine institution.‡ They say it is evident that belief or faith must precede baptism; but they add, infants are not capable of believing; therefore, neither are they capable of being baptized. They boast that the Scripture is evidently for Baptist practice—that other Protestants hold traditional doctrines, like

* M. De la Rogue.
† Leibnitz, (1716).
‡ Jeremy Taylor.

the Catholics.* While Catholics say—We Romanists have little to fear from you: the controversy is not between us and you; it is with the Baptists. There are but two parties in the contest, ourselves and the Baptists.†

Would the Protestant Church fulfil and attain to its final destiny, the baptism of new-born children must of necessity be abolished. It cannot from any point of view be justified by the Holy Scriptures.‡

AS CATHOLICS VIEW IT.

Q. Can Protestants prove to Baptists that the baptism of infants is good and useful?

Ans. No, they cannot; because, according to Protestant principles, such baptism is useless.

Q. Why do you say this?

Ans. One of the Protestant principles is, that no human being can be justified except by an act of faith in Jesus Christ; but no infant is capable of making this act of faith; therefore, upon Protestant principles, the baptism of infants is useless.

Q. Can you draw the same consequences from any other principle?

* Roman Cath. Catechism.

† Bishop Baily of Newark, N. J., to Pedob. Minister.

‡ Prof. Lange, Hist. Prot., p. 34-45.

Ans. Yes; their first principle is, that nothing is to be practiced, which is not authorized by Scriptural example; but it does not appear from Scripture that even one infant was ever baptized; therefore, Protestants should reject, on their own principles, infant baptism as an unscriptural usage.

Q. How do Baptists treat other Protestants?

Ans. They boast that the Scripture is evidently for Baptist practice—that other Protestants hold traditional doctrines, like the Catholics. They quote Matt. chap. xxviii., "Go teach all nations, baptizing them," from which they say, it is clear that teaching should go before baptism; hence, they conclude, that as infants cannot be taught, so neither should they be baptized until they are capable of teaching or instruction.

Q. What use do they make of Mark, chap. xvi.—"He who believeth and is baptized shall be saved?"

Ans. They say it is evident that belief or faith must precede baptism; but, they add, children or infants are not capable of believing; therefore, neither are they capable of being baptized.

Q. What can Protestants reply to this Baptist reasoning?

Ans. They may give these passages another meaning, but they can never prove that their interpretation is better than that of the Baptists, because they themselves give every one a right to interpret Scripture.

Q. What inference do you draw from this?

Ans. That every Protestant has much reason to doubt whether he be baptized.

Q. How do Catholics prove that infants ought to be baptized?

Ans. Not from Scripture alone, which is not clear on this subject, but from the Scripture, illustrated by the constant tradition of the church, which, in every age, administered baptism to infants, and consequently the practice must have been derived from the apostles.

Q. Can Protestants use this triumphant argument of tradition against the Baptists?

Ans. No; they have no right to use it in this matter where it would serve them, since they reject it in every question where it is opposed to their novel and lately invented doctrines.*

* An Extract from A Doctrinal Catechism: by Rev. Stephen Keenan. Approved by John Hughes, D. D., Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, 1851.

XVIII.

AS SUBSTITUTED BY POURING AND SPRINKLING.

ITH infant baptism, still another change in the outward form of baptism, was introduced—that of sprinkling with water, instead of the former practice of immersion.* For it is without controversy that baptism in the *primitive church* was administered by immersion into water, and not by sprinkling. So too, the essential act of baptizing in the *second century*, consisted, not in sprinkling, but in immersion into water, in the name of each person in the Trinity. Concerning immersion, the words and phrases that are used sufficiently testify; and that it was performed in a river, pool or fountain. To the essential rite of baptism in the *third century*, pertained immersion, and not aspersion, except in cases of necessity, and it was accounted a *half perfect* baptism.† And controversy arose concerning it, so unheard

* Fritsch, Bib. Theol., Vol. 3, p. 507.

† Venema, His. Eccle., Sec. i.; ii.; iii.

of was it at that time to baptize by simple affusion.* Immersion in the *fourth century*, was one of those acts that were considered as essential to baptism; nevertheless aspersion was used in the last moments of life on such as were clinics,†—which Rufinus rightly translates *perfusum*—poured about, for those who are sick, were baptized in bed. Therefore, baptism of this sort was not customary, and was esteemed imperfect, as being what appeared to be received by men laboring under delirium, not willingly, but from fear of death. In addition, since baptism properly signifies immersion, a pouring of this sort could hardly be called baptism, therefore, Clinics were forbidden to be promoted to the rank of the ministry, by the twelfth canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea. ‡

Cyprian *first* defended baptism by sprinkling, when necessity called for it, but cautiously and with much limitation §—saying to Magnus, "You ask, dear son, what I think of those, who, in sickness receive the sacred ordinance; whether, since they are not washed (loti) in the *saving* water, but have it poured on them, (perfusi) they are to

* Knapp's Theo., p. 487.

† Venema, as above.

‡ Valesius, from R. Fuller on Bap., p. 81.

§ Knapp, as above.

be esteemed right Christians. In the *saving* sacraments, when necessity obliges, and God grants His indulgence, *abridgements* of divine things, (divina compendia), will confer the whole on believers."* By degrees, however, this mode of baptism became more customary, probably because it was found more *convenient;* especially was this the case after the *seventh century*, and in the Western Church, but it did not become universal (even there) until the commencement of the *fourteenth century.*†

The *first law* for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II. being driven from Rome by Astolphus, King of Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there, the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him, whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed, which, however, some Catholics deny, yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in cases of necessity. It was not till the year 1311 that the Legislature, in a Council held

* Cyprian.

† Knapp, as above.

at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent.* France seems to have been the *first* country where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it.† In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI. immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that Church. In 1556 a book was published at that place, containing the form of prayers and ministrations of sacraments, approved by the famous and godly man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and returning to their own country with John Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the estab-

* Edinburgh Ency., Ed. by Sir David Brewster. Art. Bap.
† Dr. Wall, His. Inf. Bap., Part 2, ch. 9.

lished Church.* It being allowed to weak children, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to be baptised by aspersion, many fond ladies and gentlewomen *first*, and *then* by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the Priest to have their children *pass* for weakly children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. As for *sprinkling* properly so called, it was, at 1645, just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times of forty-one (1641). They—the Assembly of Divines in Westminster—reformed the font into a basin. This learned Assembly could not remember that fonts to baptize in had always been used by the primitive churches, long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built; but that sprinkling for the purpose of baptizing was really introduced (in France *first*, and *then* in other popish countries), in times of Popery; and that accordingly, all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been owned, have left off dipping of children in the font, but that all other countries in the world, which have never regarded his authority, do still use it. And though the English received not this custom till after the decay of Popery, yet they have since received it from such neighbor nations

* Edin. Ency. as above.

as had begun it in the time of the Pope's power. For the way that is now ordinarily used, we cannot deny to have been a novelty, brought into this church (English) by those that learned it in Germany or at Geneva. And they were not contented to follow the example of pouring a quantity of water, which had there been introduced instead of immersion, but improved it, if I may so abuse that word, from pouring to sprinkling, that it might have as little resemblance to the ancient way of baptizing as possible.* Hence not only the Catholic Church, but also the *pretended* reformed churches, have *altered* this primitive custom, and now allow of baptism by pouring or sprinkling water on the person baptized. Nay, many of their ministers do it nowadays by fillipping a wet finger and thumb over a child's head, or shaking a wet finger or two over a child; which is hard enough to call baptism in any sense.† The Baptists, in fact, are the only denomination of *Christians* who have not symbolized with the Church of Rome,‡ and, with the two exceptions of the Cathedral of Milan, and the sect of the Baptists, a few drops of water are now the Western substitute.§

* Dr. Wall, as above.

† Dr. R. Wetham, Rom. Cath., Annot. on Matt. iii. 6.

‡ Newton.

§ Dean Stanley, Hist. Eastern Church, p. 117.

Under these circumstances it is certainly to be lamented that Luther was not able to accomplish his wish with regard to the introduction of immersion in baptism, as he had done in the restoration of the wine in the Eucharist.* For if we say—The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants†—the Catholics reply—Show us, my Lords, the validity of your baptism, 'by Scripture alone.' Jesus Christ there ordains that it shall be conferred, not by pouring water on the heads of believers, but by believers being plunged into water. The word *baptizo* employed by the Evangelists, strictly conveys this signification, as the learned are agreed; and at the head of them Casaubon, of all the Calvinists, the best versed in the Greek language. Now baptism by immersion has ceased for many ages, and you yourselves as well as we, have only received it by affusion. It would, therefore, be all over with your baptism, unless you established it by tradition and the practice of the Church. This being settled, I ask you from whom have you received baptism? Is it not from the Church of Rome? And what do you think of her? Do you not consider her as heretical, and even idola-

* Drs. Storr and Flatt's Theol., Vol. ii., p. 291.

† Chillingworth.

trous? You cannot, then, according to the terms of Scripture, prove the validity of your baptism; and to produce a plea for it, you are obliged to seek it with Pope Stephen, and the councils of Arles and Nice, and in Apostolic tradition.*

* Right Rev. Dr. Trevern (Rom. Cath.), in La Discussion Amicale to Protestant Clergy.

XIX.

AS PRESERVED BY THE BAPTISTS.

THE true origin of that sect which acquired the name Anabaptist, *is hid in the remote depths of Antiquity*, and is consequently extremely difficult to be ascertained.[1] On this account, the Baptists—who were formerly called Anabaptists—may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the Apostles, and as a Christian Society, has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth disputed by the Romish Church, that the Reformation, brought about in the sixteenth century, was in the highest degree necessary, and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics that their

[1] Mosheim's Ch. Hist, (Maclaine's), Vol. ii, p. 127.

communion is the most ancient.* Before Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe many persons who adhered tenaciously to the doctrines of the Dutch Baptists,† and for *thirteen hundred years* had caused great disturbance in the Church.‡ And, if the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinions and persuasions of no sect can be truer or surer, than those of the *anabaptists ;* since there have been none (1570), for these *twelve hundred years* past, that have been more grievously punished.§ In Ponton, Cologne, Germany, Swederland, etc., many thousands of this sect, who defiled their first baptism by a second, were baptized the third time in their own blood.‖ And in almost all the countries of Europe, *an unspeakable number of Baptists* preferred death in its worst

* Dr. Ypeij, Prof. Theol., Groningen, and Dr. J. J. Dermont, chaplain to King of Netherlands in Hist. Dutch Baptists.

† Mosheim, Ch. Hist.

‡ Zwingle, the Swiss Reformer, from Orchard's Hist., p. 17.

§ Cardinal Hossius, Chairman at Council of Trent, from Orchard's Hist. Baptists, p. 364.

‖ De Featly—The same who, in 1644, entreated the House of Lords, that Milton might be cut off, "as a pestilent Anabaptist."

forms to a retraction of their sentiments.* This sect had the honor both of leading the way, and bringing up the rear, of all the martyrs who were burnt alive in England.† And so numerous were they, and so rigorously persecuted, that the *records show* that *over seventy thousand* of them were, in King Henry's time, punished by fines, by imprisonment, by banishment, or by burning.‡ The Baptists that were burnt in different parts of the Kingdom, went to death intrepidly and without any fear.§

They suffered death, not on account of their being considered rebellious subjects, but merely because *they were judged to be incurable heretics;* for, in this century (the 16th), the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of rebaptizing such as had received the sacrament in infancy, were looked upon as the most flagitious and intolerable of heresies.‖

Thus the party was trodden under foot with foul reproaches and most arrogant scorn; and

* Mosheim.

† From Westlake's Gen. View.

‡ Strype's History.

§ Bishop Latimer, Lent Sermons.

‖ Mosheim, Eccle. Hist., Cent. 16, Sec. 3, Part 2. ch. iii.

its history is written in the blood of myriads of the German peasantry; but its principles, safe in their immortality, escaped with Roger Williams to Providence; and his colony is the witness that *naturally* the paths of the Baptists are paths of freedom, pleasantness and peace. For freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind was, *from the first*, the trophy of the Baptists. *

In accordance with these principles, Roger Williams insisted in Massachusetts upon allow-

NOTE.—It may be stated that the Baptists believe the ordinances should be administered to regenerated believers only, not exclusively to adults, but to children also, who give evidence of being born of the Spirit. *a*. And doubtless if baptism was not rightly administered with reference to those things which belong to the substance of it, it is all one as if the person had not been baptized; and, therefore, he is to be *baptized* and not re-baptized. *b*. And respecting the form of baptism the impartial historian is compelled by exegesis and history substantially to yield the point to the Baptists, as is done in fact by most German scholars. *c*. Hence, "If the Baptists are *historically* right, and we wrong, let us discontinue our disputes with them as to the meaning of Greek verbs, and give due honor to the original mode of baptism both by our preaching and practice." *d*.

Note (*a*) Imperial Dic. (English).

(*b*) Buddeus, Theol. Dog., i., v., c. 1, § 10.

(*c*) Dr. P. Schaff, Hist. Apo. Ch. p. 568.

(*d*) Rev. A. L. Park, in Christian Mirror, June 29th, 1875.

* Bancroft's Hist. U. States.

ing entire freedom of conscience, and upon entire separation of the Church and the State. But he was obliged to flee, and in 1636 he formed in Rhode Island, a small and new society, in which perfect freedom in matters of faith was allowed, and in which the majority ruled in all civil affairs. Here, in a little State, the fundamental principles of political and ecclesiastical liberty practically prevailed, before they were even taught in any of the schools of philosophy in Europe. At that time people predicted only a short existence for these democratical experiments. But not only have these ideas and these forms of government maintained themselves here, but, precisely from this little State, have they extended themselves throughout the United States. They have conquered the aristocratic tendencies in Carolina and New York, the High Church in Virginia, the theocracy in Massachusetts, and the monarchy in all America. They have given laws to a continent, and, formidable through their moral influence, *they lie at the bottom of all the democratic movements which are now shaking the nations of Europe.** Thus

* German Philosopher, Gervinus, Introd. to His., 19th Century.

he began the first civil government on the earth which gave equal liberty of conscience.*

To conclude then—The Baptists are a people very fond of religious liberty, and very unwilling to be brought under bondage of the judgment of others.† As regards their form of government, they are, as every one knows Independents, who perform the rite of baptism, like the primitive Christians, by immersion.‡ Their origin is hid in the depths of antiquity.§ They have preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages.‖ They are the only denomination of Christians who have not symbolized with the Church of Rome.¶ And let it never be forgotten of the particular Baptists of England that they form the denomination of Fuller, and Carey, and Ryland, and Hall, and Foster; that they have originated one among the greatest of all missionary enterprises; that they have enriched the Christian literature of our country with authorship of the most exalted piety, as

* Southey.
† Baily in 1639.
‡ Dr. Bunsen, On Signs of the Times.
§ Mosheim, as above.
‖ Hist. Ref. Dutch Ch., Ed. Breda, 1819.
¶ Newton.

well as of the first talent and the first eloquence; that they have waged a very noble and successful war with the hydra of Antinomianism; that, perhaps, there is not a more intellectual community of ministers in our island, or who have put forth, in proportion to their number a greater amount of mental power and mental activity in the defence of our common faith; and what is better than all the triumphs of genius or understanding, who, by their zeal and fidelity, and pastoral labor among the congregations which they have reared, have done more to swell the lists of genuine discipleship in all the walks of private society, and thus both to uphold and to extend the living Christianity of our nation.*

* Dr. Chalmers, in sermon on Rom. iv. 9-15.

XX.

AS FAIRLY VIEWED—A PLEA FOR INCONSISTENCY.

"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth." Rom. xiv. 22.

"There are many [illegible] to a general rule, but they will not [illegible] to be [illegible]."

—*Bishop Taylor.*

IT is said that the lawfulness of any other baptism than by immersion will be found to lie in the *necessity* there may sometimes be of another manner of administering of it.* That the *danger* of dipping in cold climates, may be a very good reason for changing the form of baptism to sprinkling.† That the Church claims the *right* to regulate, at her just discretion, whatever regards the manner of administering the Sacraments.‡ That the Holy Scriptures speak only of baptism by immersion. But the dogma of

* Dr. Lawrence's Sac. of Bap. Part III., pp. [illegible]

† Bishop Burnet.

‡ Archb. Kenrick, from Am. Cyclop., Art. Bapt. Cath.

the Church is to sprinkle, and we should in this, as in everything else, follow the Church.* That it is left to *latitude*, to *convenience*, to the *taste*, *fancy*, and *preference* of all.† That it is of *no consequence* at all whether the person baptized is totally immersed, or whether he is merely sprinkled by an affusion of water. This should be a matter of choice to the churches in different regions, although the word *baptize* signifies to *immerse*, and the rite of immersion was practiced by the ancient Church.‡ That, if *experience* shows a certain ordinance to be good, it is your right to adopt it, whether Scripture points it out or not.§ That it is not essential to salvation.‖ That if baptism was first administered by immersion, might not a regard to usage, to decency or to convenience, be a sufficient reason for varying the mode?¶

Replies.—We cannot think God will honor the inventions of men, however they may be dignified by the specious names of *useful*, *decent*,

* Roman Cath. Catec.
† Dr. Cumming.
‡ John Calvin, founder of Pres. Ch.
§ H. W. Beecher in Ser. May, 1864.
‖ General.
¶ Dr. L. Woods' Works, Vol. iii., p. 460.

agreeable, or *prudent contrivances;* yet, if they are an addition to His system, will He not say: *Who hath required these things at your hands?* * And that principle that the Church hath power to institute any thing or ceremony belonging to the worship of God, either as to matter or to *manner*, beyond the orderly observance of such circumstances as necessarily attend such ordinances as Christ Himself hath instituted, lies at the bottom of all the horrible superstition and idolatry, of all the confusion, blood, persecution, and wars, that have for so long a season spread themselves over the surface of the Christian world.†

But to serve God otherwise than He requireth, is not to *worship*, but to rob and mock Him.‡ And true philosophy as well as true Christianity, would teach us a wiser and more modest spirit. It would teach us to be content within those bounds which God has assigned us.§ As before stated: Nothing is a privilege in the religious sense, but what God has made such; and He has made nothing such, except in

* Archibald Hall's View of Gospel Church, p. 82.

† Dr. Owen's Sermon.

‡ B'p Reynolds' Works, p. 163.

§ Lord Lyttelton, Conv. of Paul, p. 67.

His own way, and on His own terms. Baptism is a privilege when administered and received in the manner appointed by Him, *but in no other*. When this ordinance is received in any other manner, it is plainly no obedience to any command of His, and therefore, let me add, has no encouragement to hope for a blessing.* If it *can* be obeyed, it *must;* if it *cannot*, it must be *let alone*. It is that in which God will so perfectly be obeyed that He will not be disputed with, or inquired of, *why* and *how*, but just according to the measures set down; *so and no more, and no less, and no otherwise.* † The law of the Lord is perfect.‡ The Scripture cannot be broken.§ Hence God has absolutely prohibited all men, under severe denunciations, and with terrible expressions of His anger, either to form religious institutions, or to substitute their own institutions for His.|| Rev. xxii. 18, 19. As we must take heed that we do not add the fancies of men to our Divine religion, so we must take equal care that we do

* Dr. Dwight's Sermons, Vol. iv., p. 343.

† B'p Taylor's Duc. Dub., b. ii., c. iii., § 14, 18.

‡ Ps. xix. 7.

§ John x. 35.

|| Dr. Dwight.

not *curtail* the appointments of Christ.* For it is an impious and dangerous thing to affix God's name to our own imaginations.†

But some may say, *Surely God will not be so much concerned with a failure in so small a punctilio as a ceremony!* True, it is a ceremony; but it is such a one that beareth the stamp and authority of the Lord Jesus. If He appoints it, will you slight it, and say, It is but a ceremony? Tell me, was circumcision any more than a ceremony? Yet it had almost cost Moses his life for neglecting to circumcise his son.

But I am regenerate, and become a new creature; I do not fear that God will cast me away for the disuse of a ceremony. Is this the reasoning of one regenerate? Surely thou dost not understand what regeneration meaneth. When you have considered this, then tell me what you think of this kind of reasoning; *I am a child of God, therefore I will presume to disobey Him.*‡ Why! Christian ordinances *are designed* for Christian people; for persons who are *already* saved by grace. But does it therefore follow

* Watts' Humble Attempt, p. 62.
† Dr. Owen on Heb.
‡ Wadsworth on Lord's Supper, pp. 242, 241.

LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

that an ordinance, established by Christ, has no important end to answer, and may safely be despised?* God is infinitely better able than we are to judge of the *propriety* and *usefulness* of the things He institutes; and it becomes us to obey with humility and reverence.†

The conclusion of the whole matter is, "FEAR GOD AND KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS."‡

* Dr. J. Campbell, Jethro, p. 235.
† Dr. S. Clark, Exp. Ch. Cat., p. 306.
‡ Scripture.

AUTHORS QUOTED.

1 Ainsworth.
2 Alford, Dean.
3 Alstidius.
4 Alting, J., D. D.
5 Ambrose (A. D. 390).
6 Am. Tract Soc. Pub.
7 Am. Presbyterian.
8 Anthon, Prof. Charles, Columbia College, N. Y.
9 Baily (1639).
10 Baily, Bishop.
11 Bancroft, U. S. Historian.
12 Barnes, Albert, D. D.
13 Baumgarten.
14 Baxter, Richard.
15 Beecher, H. Ward.
16 Bengel, J. Albert, Author of Gnomon.
17 Benson, Dr. G.
18 Bingham.
19 Bickersteth, E.
20 Bloomfield, Author Greek Test.
21 Bonaventure.
22 Bossuet, Bishop.
23 Brenner, Rom. Cath.
24 Bretschneider.
25 Buddeus.

26 Bunsen, Dr.
27 Burnet, Bishop.
28 Burns, J. D., D. D.
29 Bushnell, Horace, D. D.
30 Calvin, John, Founder of Presbyterian Church.
31 Campbell, Dr. G.
32 Campbell, Dr. J.
33 Casaubon.
34 Cave, Dr.
35 Chalmers, Dr.
36 Clark, Dr. Adam.
37 Clark, Dr. Samuel.
38 Chillingworth.
39 Chrysostom, (A. D. 398).
40 Coleman.
41 Conybeare.
42 Cumming, Dr.
43 Cranmer, Archbishop.
44 Conder, Rev. J.
45 Curcellus, Prof. of Divinity, Geneva.
46 Cyprian, (A. D. 253).
47 Cyril, (A. D. 374).
48 Dermont, Dr. J. J. Chaplain to King of Netherlands.
49 Doddridge, Philip, D. D.
50 Dodwell, Dr. H.
51 Donnegan, Author Lex.
52 Douay Testament.
53 D'Outreinius.
54 Dwight, Dr.
55 Ecce Homo.
56 Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica.
57 Editor Congregationalist.
58 Edinburgh Reviewers.
59 Edinburgh Cyclopedia.
60 English Imp. Dic.

61 Elliot, Bishop.
62 Estius, Rom. Cath.
63 Fabricius, Guido.
64 Fairbairn, Dr.
65 Featly, Dr.
66 Field, Dr.
67 Flatt, Prof.
68 Fritsch.
69 Fuller, Adv. Inf.
70 Gataker.
71 Gertlerus.
72 Gervinus, German Philosopher.
73 Goodwin, Dr.
74 Greenfield, Dr.
75 Griffin, Dr.
76 Grotius.
77 Hagenbach.
78 Hahn, Prof.
79 Hall, Archibald.
80 Hall, Dr. John, N. Y.
81 Halley, Dr.
82 Hanna, Dr.
83 Harness, Rev. Wm.
84 Henry, Matthew.
85 Hayne's Encyclopedia.
86 Hervey.
87 Hibbard, Dr.
88 Hoadly, Bishop.
89 Hodge, Dr. Charles.
90 Hooker.
91 Hopkins, Bishop.
92 Horne's Introduction.
93 Howson, Dean.
94 Hossius, Cardinal.

95 Jacobi, Dr.
96 Jones, Dr. John.
97 Kenrick, Archbishop.
98 King, Dr. D.
99 King, Peter, Lord High Chancellor of Eng.
100 Kitto.
101 Knapp, G. C., D. D. Prof. of Theol., Halle.
102 Koraes.
103 Lange, Dr. J. P., Prof. of Theol., University of Bonn.
104 Latimer, Bishop.
105 Leigh, Dr., Author Critica Sacra.
106 Liddel and Scott.
107 Leibnitz.
108 Lightfoot, Dr.
109 Lond. Quar. Review.
110 Luther, Martin.
111 Lyttelton, Lord.
112 Macknight, Dr.
113 Maimonides (Jew).
114 Mather, Cotton.
115 Matthies.
116 Melancthon.
117 Melville, Dr. H.
118 Meyer, Dr. H. A. W.
119 Morrison, Dr. John.
120 Mosheim, Dr. J. L.
121 Newton.
122 Neander, Dr. Augustus.
123 New Am. Encyclopedia.
124 North Brit. Review.
125 Olshausen.
126 Owen, Dr.
127 Paine, Prof. L. L., Theol. Sem. Bangor, Me.
128 Paley, Dr.

129 Park, Rev. A. L.
130 Parkhurst.
131 Phillips, Rev. Wm.
132 Polhill.
133 Porson, Prof.
134 Pressense, Dr.
135 Quenstedius.
136 Reynolds, Bishop.
137 Rheinhard.
138 Robertson, Rev. F. W.
139 Robinson, Dr. E.
140 Roel.
141 Rouge, M. De la.
142 Rosenmuller.
143 Rost, Prof. (German.)
144 Rom. Cath. Catechism.
145 Ryle, Rev. J. C.
146 Scapula.
147 Salmasius.
148 Sanderson, Bishop.
149 Schneckenberger.
150 Schleiermacher.
151 Schoettgen.
152 Schrevellius.
153 Schindler.
154 Scott, the Commentator.
155 Schaff, Philip, D.D., Prof. Theol., Pa.
156 Smith, Bishop, Ky.
157 Smith's Bib. Dic.
158 Southey.
159 Stanley, Dean.
160 Stacey, Rev.
161 Stack, Rev.
162 Stuart, Prof. M.

163 Stanhope, Dr. G.
164 Stephens.
165 Stephanus.
166 Stockius.
167 Storr, Dr.
168 Stourdza.
169 Suicerus, Prof. of Hebrew and Greek, Zurich.
170 Strype.
171 Sumner, Archb.
172 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy.
173 Taylor, Dr. Isaac.
174 Theophylact.
175 Tholuck.
176 Tilenus.
177 Thorn, Rev.
178 Trommius.
179 Towerson, Dr.
180 Trelawney, Sir H.
181 Trevern, Rev. Dr.
182 Turretine.
183 Valasius.
184 Vatablus, Prof. of Hebrew, Paris.
185 Venema.
186 Vitringa.
187 Waddington.
188 Wadsworth, Dr.
189 Watson, Richard.
190 Wardlaw, Dr.
191 Watts, Dr.
192 Wall, Dr., Vicar of Shoreham, England.
193 Wesley, John, Founder of Methodism.
194 Weiss.
195 Webster and
196 Wilkinson.

197 Wette Dr. De.
198 Wetham, Dr. R.
199 Wetstein.
200 Williams, Dr. E.
201 Witsius.
202 Wilson, Prof.
203 Woods, Dr. L., Prof. Theol., Andover.
204 Ypeij, Prof. of Theology, Groningen.
205 Zanchius.
206 Zwingle, the Swiss Reformer.

DATE DUE

MAY 1 9 1972			
MAY 1 8 1973			
OCT 2 5 1990			

265.1
R567

Rigby, N.L.
AUTHOR
United testimony of two hundred
Pedobaptist scholars to Christian
TITLE
baptism.

1395

265.1
R567

Rigby, N. L.
United testimony of two
hundred Pedobaptist
scholars to Christian baptism

1395